

**STAT**

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/01/15 :  
CIA-RDP60-00321R000300300012-3

**Page Denied**

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release @ 50-Yr 2014/01/15 :  
CIA-RDP60-00321R000300300012-3

his remarks and include criticism (Speaker.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House that Edward A. O'Neal, former president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, died last night at his home in Florence, Ala.

Mr. Ed, as he was affectionately known, was agriculture's man of the hour during the dark days of the great depression, and he led our farmers during the years of World War II when the great outpouring of food and fiber contributed so surely to the victory of our arms.

Edward Asbury O'Neal, third of a line to bear that name, was born on an Alabama plantation October 20, 1895. His life interest was agriculture, and at an early age he became dedicated to the improvement of the conditions and fortunes of the millions of farm families throughout the Nation.

Ed O'Neal served with distinction as President of the American Farm Bureau Federation for 16 years, from 1931 to 1947, and before that served as vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation and as president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation.

Many of my colleagues will recall the personal charm and courtly character of Mr. O'Neal. He was a warm personality, a loyal friend. But at the same time he was a tenacious worker, a vigorous exponent of his beliefs, a man of inexhaustible energy and undaunted courage.

Ed O'Neal was first and foremost a farmer and an agricultural leader. His name from a long line of distinguished forebears whose names are a part of the history of Alabama. He was distinctly a product of Alabama and of the South, of its people and culture, its soil and philosophy.

In 1941, on the occasion of the celebration of his 20th anniversary of leadership in American agriculture, Senator Larkin Hull of Alabama had this to say of Ed O'Neal:

He has wrought wonderfully, not only for the farmers but for the whole country. He stands forth today as one of the greatest agricultural statesmen in the history of our country. He is one of the accepted leaders of the entire Nation.

It is never pleasant to learn of the death of a dear friend. But it is a consolation to recall that Ed O'Neal enjoyed life to the hilt, that his was a good life and well spent, and that he enjoyed the honor and respect of his fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture, on which I am honored to serve, has expressed the feelings of American agriculture, on the passing of this great American, in a resolution which I am making a part of the record of the House at this point:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

February 27, 1955.

EDWARD A. O'NEAL

Whereas Edward A. O'Neal, ex-president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, led the farmers of the Nation in their perennial struggle out of the great depression; and

Whereas he planted firmly in the Nation's conscience the principle that the people who till the soil are due, and should receive, a parity of income, and should enjoy a stand-

ard of living equal to people in other employments of our free enterprise society; and Whereas farm families of America have had a better life because of his leadership, his strivings and the goals he set and

Whereas in working with the House Committee on Agriculture he endeavored himself to all its Members: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the committee has heard with profound sorrow and a sense of deep loss of the death of Edward A. O'Neal; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee express its very sincere sympathy to the widow and other members of the family; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee clerk communicate this resolution to the family of the deceased.

ALBANY

MAURICE D. CROLEY,  
Chairman.

### FOREIGN AID

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker several days ago I read with interest on the front page of the Washington Post and Times Herald a letter supposedly written by a little Vietnamese girl stating that, among other things, her people dislike Americans.

I read in the same paper today the very interesting letter by the beautiful wife of the Vietnamese Ambassador in which she states at the beginning, and I quote:

Your "little Vietnamese girl" sounds very much like a very shrewd grown-up Communist.

I think this incident should serve as a warning to those Americans who set themselves up as Gallup poll experts and advise us from time to time as to the harmful propaganda effects among the peoples of the world of various occurrences here in the United States. It just may be possible that our advisors are listening to the wrong people, and also it may be good advice to them that at times it is better to shut up than to speak up.

The complete letter by Mme. Tran Van Chuong, wife of the Ambassador of Vietnam to the United States follows:

THE VIETNAMESE LAYERS

Your "little Vietnamese girl" sounds very much like a very shrewd grown-up Communist.

Nevertheless, it is worth while answering some of "her" questions because they are intended to mislead American people into that old isolationist tendency which already cost them the Second World War and the Korean war.

American people sometimes wonder whether their aid is not requested by those who receive it and they do not even suspect that such strange misgivings have been sown into their minds by Communist propaganda. Indeed, I have never heard such questions in Vietnam, not even from children.

In Vietnam, even children cannot ignore that over 800,000 of their own people died the Communists only three and a half years ago and have been rescued and rehabilitated mostly through American aid. Is such aid selfish or unselfish? Is it being requested in Vietnam?

I am sorry to say that in Vietnam, such questions do not make sense. They are foolish.

But those who are not refugees may question the sincerity of American aid.

How could they, when there are in Vietnam no American military occupation, not even the least American military base, no American governors to dictate decisions, no American settlers to take the best pieces of land, when no privileges of any kind, have ever been demanded from our Government in exchange for sorely needed aid?

"Do American people know that 85 percent of Vietnamese people don't like them?"

Possibly. Can a true little girl choose Mr. Friendly for his friendly name to tell him such an untrue and unfriendly statement? Little Vietnamese girls cannot be so rude nor so stupid, and Vietnamese people, like all other human beings cannot dislike the United States just for having helped them to regain their national independence and to remain free.

This leads me to think that this letter to Mr. Friendly was inspired, if not fabricated, by someone interested in making the American people sick of their own program of mutual security, in making them believe just the contrary of what President Eisenhower and President Truman and other most prominent American leaders recalled to them yesterday, that is: foreign aid is as vital to their own security as nuclear weapons, and so much more effective for preserving peace and strengthening human brotherhood.

More Than Van Chuong.

WASHINGTON.

### NATIONAL GUARD

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us, as Members of the House of Representatives, are concerned about the overall military strength of the United States in this period of international tension. I feel it incumbent upon myself, however, to direct the attention of the Members to a recent proposal by the Department of Defense which, if carried out, would, in my estimation, strike a crippling blow to our military preparedness effort.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1956 includes a request for an appropriation to support the National Guard at a level which will endanger the capability of the United States to defend itself. In spite of the fact that the Department of Defense had agreed with the Committee on Armed Services to maintain the strength of the National Guard at the level of 400,000 men, this budget would provide sufficient money only for 300,000 men. When coupled with a reduction of 25,000 from the strength of 425,000 existing in May 1957, this amounts to a 75,000-man, or 17-percent, reduction within less than a year's time.

The seriousness of such a reduction should be fully realized. Although it is necessary to continue our efforts in the field of nuclear weaponry and ballistic missiles, the day has not come when we can dispense with the citizen-soldier. As the Korean war proved, he continues to be the very basic element in our military system. Indicative of this is the fact that the Russians, who are clearly not foolish in these matters, maintain 175

ending shall be the trumpet sound under the  
victorious victory choruses of the redeemed.

May His memory inspire country and  
church, family and fatherland to remember  
his noble and deeds in the light of holy  
Scripture and the pursuit of happiness. Amen.

3 copies JSW

## Foreign Aid—How We Look

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF  
**HON. EDWARD J. THYE**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Thursday, February 27, 1968

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "How We Look," which was published in the Washington Post of yesterday. The editorial is most thoughtful and timely, and I believe it will be of value to all readers of the Record to have the editorial published in it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 26, 1968]

#### How We Look

The searching questions about the United States contained in the letter from a young Vietnamese girl which we published on the front page yesterday have caused considerable consternation in Washington. Some persons assume that the letter was a Communist plant. We are convinced from what we know of the background of the letter that it was not; that the questions are sincere and that they deserve thoughtful answers. Obviously the young lady has absorbed Communist propaganda. But the views which she expresses really pose a challenge for this country to do a better job of making itself understood in Asia.

It is quite natural in a country such as Vietnam, which was long under colonial rule, that people should be suspicious of large groups of Americans who descend upon them. These suspicions are fed by the occasional Americans who are overbearing, who are impatient with the local and seldom see them except to dispense advice, who live in sumptuous houses and whose chauffeurs importunately honk for the servants to scatter. There are relatively few such persons in comparison with the numbers of Americans sympathetically doing their best to help, but they hurt. The effect of such dragage is compounded by reports of American mistreatment which are widely disseminated among the darker-skinned peoples of Asia. Although the American information service tried hard to show that the events at Little Rock were about because it was the policy of the United States Government to eliminate discrimination.

Special difficulties arise in Vietnam because of the character of the divided country and its government. Independent Vietnam was born in the war with the Communist Viet Minh. The United States quickly agreed France to grant full independence, but to some persons the United States seemed to be allied with the country they regarded as their oppressor. The Geneva armistice left Vietnam split into two parts, and when American advisers replaced French colonial administrators their motives were suspect.

The government of President Ngo Dinh Diem has proved a good bet for American help in establishing stability. Mr. Diem is an ardent nationalist, and his objectives are

praiseworthy. But he has little understanding of the function or importance of a democratic opposition, and there has been an automatic cast to his regime. The reasons why he resists nationwide elections for re-election have never been fully explained. Part of the task in Vietnam is for Americans to take the people more fully into his confidence.

American aid to Vietnam last year amounted to nearly \$600 million. Much of this went directly or indirectly into support of the 10-division army maintained against the Communist threat. But there is an impressive showing for economic help—reconstruction of nearly a million refugees, a flourishing agriculture, small industries starting up.

It is difficult at best to explain that the primary interest of the United States in extending aid is to assist other countries to maintain their freedom. The quest for markets is easily disposed of; American exports to Vietnam last year amounted to only \$75 million out of a worldwide American total of \$19.8 billion. But to many Asians the United States unquestionably does seem more interested in signing up anti-Communist allies in the cold war than in helping people for their own sake.

Obviously there is no simpler answer to the young Vietnamese girl, but part of it lies in official American attitudes. Communism, and even the brutal events in Hungary, are something remote from the experience of many Asians. But what the United States has done to help neutral India without strings—and the eloquent thanks of the Finance Minister for pioneering the concept of aid by richer countries to those less fortunately placed—does have meaning in Asian terms.

What the episode really illustrates is that, whatever may be the shortcomings of the American information program, the information people can't do the whole job by themselves. The need is for official actions and statements to reflect an understanding of Asian desires, for recognition by Americans at home that their own conduct is on trial. The need is for American representatives abroad who are trained in local languages, who are willing to live on a modest scale and who can win the trust of the people.

It is particularly fitting that the Vietnamese letter should have arrived at a time when discussion of foreign aid is so current in Washington. Far from regarding this single instance impatiently as a rebuke or a demonstration of ingratitude, administrators and legislators ought to look upon it as a stimulus. We hope that the young lady will receive many answers—and that the appropriate answers will be translated into official policy.

**St. Joseph's College Ranks Among Top Five in Nation in Number of Degrees in Physics**

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF  
**HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, February 26, 1968

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great sense of pride that I read recently in the publication of St. Joseph's College, The Hawk, an article reporting that this outstanding Philadelphia institution, located in my congressional district, is among the top five institutions of higher education in the

Nation in the granting of degrees to physics majors.

This is a really remarkable record, I believe. St. Joseph's ranked after the University of California, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, and the University of California at Los Angeles.

I congratulate the Very Reverend J. Joseph Stodt, S. J., the president of this outstanding institution, for its outstanding physics department. Also, Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous interest being displayed by our Government and by the Congress, as well as by our citizens generally, in the problem of educating more scientists, this is an achievement, which I believe merits the attention of the Congress.

Consequently, I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the Record the article referred to in the Hawk of St. Joseph's College, as follows:

#### COLLEGE RANKS FIFTH IN PHYSICS MAJORS

The American Institute of Physics recently announced St. Joseph's College ranked fifth in the Nation as regards the number of degrees granted to physics majors in 1966. This information resulted from a national survey recently conducted by the Institute.

Only 18 of the colleges surveyed granted more than 20 degrees in physics to June graduates. St. Joseph's granted 23. The first four schools were The University of California, MIT, Harvard, University of California at Los Angeles.

St. Joseph's has placed every one of its students seeking employment after graduation in industry since the inception of the cooperative program in 1951. The rest of the students have gone on to graduate work in physics, mathematics and engineering.

The physics department is now educating 200 undergraduates at St. Joseph's. Included in this number are 54 sophomores promoted, 100 freshman physics majors and 66 physics majors from the upper classes.

Rev. John O'Connor, S. J., has announced that the physics department has received an anonymous donation of \$12,000. Part of this sum will be used to set up a medal for the highest average in physics in sophomore year.

## Death of Bob Reeves, Jr., Fighter for Good Government

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF  
**HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH**

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Thursday, February 27, 1968

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while the 90th Congress was in adjournment between its sessions, Texas lost one of her most active workers and fighters for good government. Bob Reeves, Sr., died at Franklin, county seat of Robertson County, Tex., on November 20, 1967.

Utterly courageous, he served for 16 years as sheriff of Robertson County, thwarting one bank robbery in progress with a gun duel, with a bandit.

Bob Reeves managed campaign after campaign for me in Robertson County in our 8-year fight to take the leadership of the Democratic Party out of the hands of its enemies who were seeking its defeat

mittee's business has been condemned as McCarthy was condemned.

The conclusion to be drawn from this difference in the attitude toward the two investigations is not that Dr. Schwartz' methods are unspeakably wicked but that Mr. McCarthy's weren't unspeakably wicked, either. Surely no one can pretend that corruption in public office is a trivial matter, but neither is the progress of the Communist conspiracy in this country a trivial matter. Both are extremely serious subjects, requiring the attention of Congress.

Dr. Schwartz was determined to expose weaknesses in the organization of the regulatory commissions because if they are left uncorrected our Government itself will be undermined. Mr. McCarthy was equally zealous to keep Communists from undermining the military and moral strength of our people.

Of the two dangers, that of communism is the greater and more immediate, for it is no secret that the Reds are determined to destroy freedom in the United States if they can, by any means that comes to their hand. They may have the means at this moment.

Public opinion today is on the side of Dr. Schwartz. The people want to know, and believe they have a right to know, whether the officials in the regulatory agencies are honest; whether Sherman Adams, the President's chief assistant, has intervened in behalf of any litigant before these agencies; whether Thomas E. Dewey, as a lawyer, has taken any advantage of the fact that the administration is heavily indebted to him for Mr. Eisenhower's elevation to the Presidency.

Similarly, we have always believed the people for the most part were with Senator McCarthy. They thought they had a right to know whether the cause of communism was being advanced in this country and abroad as a result of carelessness in guarding our military secrets or the infiltration of American installations by Communist spies.

The people were right both times. Those of us who refused to join the clamor against McCarthy are consistent in upholding Dr. Schwartz. It is those who were anti-McCarthy but are now pro-Schwartz who need to explain an inconsistency.

Dewey at Manila

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

The missile which the United States Navy Department fired 60 years ago, on February 25, 1898, directed to Adm. George Dewey, at Hong Kong, hit solidly on its impact area, 10,000 miles away, and started a chain reaction that established United States supremacy in the Pacific Ocean and had far-reaching effects upon our history. The war-headed message was dispatched by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Theodore Roosevelt, the centennial anniversary of whose birth on October 27, 1858, is now being observed. It compelled worldwide recognition of the United States as a power with which all nations must reckon in their immediate or long-distance planning.

War with Spain was imminent. Theodore Roosevelt realized the vital importance of

preventing action by the Spanish Fleet at Manila. His message to Admiral Dewey said: "Order the squadron except *Monocacy* to Hong Kong. Keep full of coal. In the event of declaration of war (with) Spain, your duty will be to see that Spanish squadron does not leave the Asiatic coast, and then (conduct) offensive operations in Philippine Islands. Keep *Olympia* (flagship) until further orders."

As a result of this order, Admiral Dewey concentrated and prepared his fleet at Hong Kong, which he left on April 27, under further instructions from Secretary of the Navy John D. Long, "to commence operations at once, particularly against Spanish fleet. You must capture vessels or destroy."

Dewey arrived off Manila late April 30 and commenced his bombardment early May 1, with 6 warships and a revenue cutter against the Spanish fleet of 10 ships aided by the shore batteries. All Spanish ships were sunk or put out of action and Dewey commenced and successfully maintained his blockade of Manila the same day.

On August 13, Manila surrendered to Admiral Dewey. Thus the Philippines were lost by Spain. Their acquisition, and that of Hawaii, contributed greatly to our dominance in the Pacific Ocean. Historians credit these results to the foresight and courage of Theodore Roosevelt, and the effective execution of his order to Admiral Dewey on February 25, 1898.

Of Admiral Dewey's accomplishment, Theodore Roosevelt later wrote:

"Admiral Dewey has done more than add a glorious page to our history; more even than do a deed the memory of which will always be an inspiration to his countrymen, and especially his countrymen of his own profession. He has also taught us a lesson which should have profound practical effects, if only we are willing to learn it aright.

"In the first place, he partly grasped and partly made his opportunity. Of course, in a certain sense, no man can absolutely make an opportunity. \* \* \* Nevertheless when the chance does come, only the great man can see it instantly and use it aright. In the second place, it must always be remembered that the power of using the chance aright comes only to the man who has faithfully and for long years made ready himself and his weapons for the possible need."

Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues of the House may not have heard the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., on February 19, in which he interviewed Mr. George Brada, a native of Czechoslovakia who lives in Munich, and who is the administrative assistant to Dr. Walter Becher, a leading member of the Bavarian Parliament.

The interviews deals with the type of job Radio Free Europe is doing. Since all of us in the Congress are vitally interested in the reactions of Europeans to this activity, it is my feeling that my colleagues and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should have the benefit of Mr. Lewis' broadcast, which follows:

FULTON LEWIS, JR., BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 19, 1958

Mr. LEWIS. Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I have for you what I consider a very important witness in the Radio Free Europe story. All through this thing, the Free Europe sponsors have been begging the most important question involved; they say it is all a noble enterprise because it is sending the message of truth and freedom to the captive people behind the Iron Curtain. Granted this is an admirable enterprise, the question is whether this is actually what they're doing. A lot of important people are taken to Munich every year on plush junkets to see the machinery in operation and get a stopoff in Paris on the way back, and they say what a wonderful thing it is. The catch is that none of them really knows, because none of them is ever able to find out what these broadcasts are really saying, what line they're taking—they are all in foreign languages—they could be saying anything and not even the American officials would know because they can't understand the language either.

Tonight I have with me Mr. George Brada, a native of Czechoslovakia, who lives in Munich, who is administrative assistant to Dr. Walter Becher who, in turn, is one of the leading members of the Bavarian Parliament, both of whom are in this country as visitors. He is in a position to tell us, firsthand, what the truth is and what these broadcasts really do say.

Mr. Brada, you have seen the stacks of photostats which I have been presenting to my listeners, as evidence of what is really going on in Radio Free Europe and what is being said in their broadcasts—are you able to tell us whether or not these photostats are authentic? Do you have any way of knowing?

Mr. BRADA. Oh, yes. I have seen thousands of Radio Free Europe documents, and these that you have are absolutely authentic. You see, Mr. Lewis, the great majority of people working for Radio Free Europe in Munich are entirely out of sympathy with what they are doing. Most of them, if they were able to earn the same living in some other way, would not be working there at all. In other words, there is an anti-Communist underground in the operation.

Mr. LEWIS. And the employees have access to the files?

Mr. BRADA. They have constant access to the files, and they can very easily remove documents which they consider important or which show how the broadcasting is protecting communism. They bring them out to show to friends, or they will bring them out for anybody they think can be helpful in exposing what is going on. They have no sense of loyalty to the organization. They are merely earning a living.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, Mr. Brada, you have heard many Radio Free Europe broadcasts, I assume.

Mr. BRADA. I have made it my business since early 1952 to monitor the broadcasts, either by listening to them or recording them or by reading the scripts.

Mr. LEWIS. The Crusade for Freedom advertises these broadcasts as being a great fight against communism and a message of truth and freedom to the people behind the Iron Curtain. What is your opinion of them?

Mr. BRADA. Oh, they sometimes use the word freedom, but they never use it in the sense of giving back to the people the freedom that the people once knew. They never use it in the sense of freedom as the Western World knows freedom. This is just an empty word with them. They talk of freedom in terms that amount to a return to the national front governments which were led by Communists. At that time, they also talked about freedom, but the people knew very well there was no freedom.

A1664

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

February 24

Mr. LEWIS. Do the broadcasts denounce communism, as we are led to believe?

Mr. BRADA. They denounce Communist Russia \* \* \* they denounce Stalinist communism \* \* \* but they praise and promote the development of National communism. They never recognize the internal danger of communism to these countries as you recognize it to your country here in the United States.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, could you enlarge on that a little?

Mr. BRADA. Well, yes, in this way: they never make any mention of your congressional investigations into communism or subversive activities. I have never heard the first word about the Alger Hiss case, or about how China was lost to the Communists or the Harry Dexter White case, or any of the others. These things are carefully concealed in the same way that the true story of the communization of these Iron Curtain countries through the national front governments are concealed. They never mention the truth about the working methods and tactics of the state security police, and its agents-provocateurs in the East at the present time.

Mr. LEWIS. What is their attitude toward the Gomulka government of Poland?

Mr. BRADA. They picture Gomulka as a great national hero in whom they place all their hopes for the future. The proof of the fact that they are very friendly to Gomulka lies in the fact that Gomulka's government no longer makes any attempt to jam their broadcasts.

Mr. LEWIS. What about Tito?

Mr. BRADA. It is the same with Tito. They spend many hours every day in favorable propaganda about Tito and Titoism, but they constantly soft-pedal or eliminate any criticism of what is wrong in Titoism. You see, Mr. Lewis, much of the evil that is done by the Radio Free Press propaganda is done by emphasizing the things that are favorable to national communism, and never mentioning the things that are unfavorable to it.

Mr. LEWIS. Would you say that the broadcasts are soft toward communism?

Mr. BRADA. I would say very definitely, yes. They take the line that no real effort toward liberation of the people in the East is necessary or even desirable, and that if everybody simply has faith, the evolution of Titoism or Gomulkaism will follow in the other countries as a natural course of events. They preach the idea that communism eventually will just fade away of itself.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Brada, do you think that communism has faded away in Poland or in Yugoslavia?

Mr. BRADA. You are asking the wrong person, Mr. Lewis. Ask the tens of thousands of Polish and Yugoslav refugees who are constantly escaping from both countries. Or, if you can, ask some of the hundreds of thousands in both countries who are starving under the Communist system.

Mr. LEWIS. Radio Free Europe talks about "truth dollars" and the "message of truth" being sent behind the Iron Curtain. Is it the truth, Mr. Brada?

Mr. BRADA. Yes, in a sense, they tell the truth. Most of the broadcasting time is allocated to a never-ending repetition of banalities. It is a sort of special little game of truth that Radio Free Europe plays for itself. It goes something like this: The Communists call the Americans imperialists. Americans are not imperialists. The Communists claim they want peace. The Communists do not want peace. This endless repetition of trivialities only spreads boredom and turns listeners away. The question is not whether they are telling the truth but whether they are telling any truths that amount to anything or accomplish anything. The fact is you can impart many lies and

make much evil propaganda by telling the truth.

Mr. LEWIS. Now, just what is the real purpose behind the Radio Free Europe propaganda, Mr. Brada?

Mr. BRADA. The real purpose, Mr. Lewis, is very simple. Radio Free Europe is being operated by the discredited politicians of the old national front governments, who collaborated with the Communists and finally sold their countries out to communism. They fled to the West, and merely continue their political activities, using the radio transmitters of Radio Free Europe to try to continue the political propaganda which they no longer could deliver in person. Their purpose is the same purpose they had before they fled into exile—the communization of their nations. These people are not any high-minded idealists who are interested in freedom and liberty and justice and a restoration of all those things to their home countries. These people are politicians—discredited politicians, at that—and their purpose and hope is somehow to get themselves back into control, so they can impose their own private brand of communism on their countries in place of the present brand. That's the reason they are soft on Tito and soft on Gomulka. They want to be Titos and Gomulkas themselves.

Mr. LEWIS. And you don't approve of that?

Mr. BRADA. It is unimportant, Mr. Lewis, whether I approve or not. If the American people want to pay the bill for any such operation, that is their privilege. But if they are paying the bill, it seems to me that they should know what they are paying for, and not be asked to support it under false pretenses.

Mr. LEWIS. Thank you, Mr. George Brada, we appreciate your taking the time to tell us the facts about the Free Europe broadcasts.

### A Bill To Facilitate Construction of a Superliner Passenger Vessel

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the payment of construction differential and cost of national defense features of a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the North Atlantic to replace the Steamship *America* which is about to become obsolete.

This bill carries the language recommended by the Department of Commerce in its report on H. R. 9342, which is the original bill of the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. BONNER.

In addition to the wording suggested by the administration amending Mr. BONNER's measure to authorize building of a sister ship to the steamship *United States*, I have added a provision so that for purposes of determining the fair cost of national defense features to be paid by the Government the normal commercial speed for the superliner shall be considered as 28.5 knots without a penalty if the ship averages a running speed up to but not exceeding 30.7 knots.

The impasse in negotiations between the United States Lines and the Federal

Maritime Board has been over the factor of what should be considered the normal commercial speed.

My bill would have Congress set the new vessel's normal speed as 28.5 knots which is the average running speed of England's *Queen Mary* and *Queen Elizabeth*.

Testimony of Clarence Morse, Maritime Administrator, backed by the General Accounting Office was to the effect that he had construed 30.7 knots to be the normal commercial speed because this has been the average speed of the steamship *United States*.

Mr. Morse has stated an agreement could be reached between the United States Lines and the Maritime Board within the framework of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 if 28.5 knots was established by Congress as the basic peacetime speed of the ship.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this legislation I have sought to break the roadblock to an agreement under present policy and law without having the Government build the ship and sell it at a fixed price as provided by the chairman's bill. Certain strong objections raised by the administration would be eliminated by this new bill and I think it might encounter less obstacles before and after final passage.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the importance of an agreement between the proposed operator and the Government. The Navy says there is a vital need of the new ship as an auxiliary troop transport in the event of war, and that speed is the best safeguard against the submarine menace.

Likewise let me point out the economy of a privately built ship ready for use if necessary, as against Navy vessels with 100 percent Government cost of construction and maintenance.

The distinguished chairman of the House Maritime Committee has made valiant efforts to work out a means of arranging for construction of the new superliner. My purpose is to assist the chairman to harmonize the differences between the various parties of interest.

### Tom Little's Finest Hour

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 24, 1958

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest political cartoonists of our generation, Tom Little, was signally honored by Samman Evans, Jr., and his newspaper, the Nashville Tennessean, the other evening at a giant dinner in his honor. Friends and cartoonists from over the Nation gathered in Nashville to do honor to this Pulitzer prize-winning cartoonist of 1956, who for 43 years has worked on this great newspaper. He was again given National recognition by Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, a few days ago, receiving